

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 JOSEPH STANLEY PIGOTT,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.
12

13 HEATHER WINSLOW BARR, et al.,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C19-1489RSM

ORDER STRIKING ALL MOTIONS AND
TO SHOW CAUSE

15 *Pro se* Plaintiff Joseph Stanley Pigott has been granted leave to proceed *in forma*
16 *pauperis* in this matter. Dkt. #32. The Complaint was posted on the docket on October 25,
17 2019. Dkt. #33. Summonses have not yet been issued. However, prior to any of this, Mr.
18 Pigott attempted to serve Defendants and file proofs of service. *See* Dkts. #3 and #4. These
19 proofs are obviously deficient as the summonses were served on Defendants before Mr. Pigott
20 was granted IFP status and before the Clerk could issue summonses. Because Summonses
21 have not yet been issued, no Defendant has been properly served and it is not possible for any
22 Defendant to be in default.
23
24

25 Mr. Pigott of Burien brings suit against his ex-wife Heather Winslow Barr and several
26 attorneys involved with divorce proceedings in King County Superior Court. Dkt. #33. He
27 claims that the divorce proceedings violated the Moorish American Treaty of Peace &
28

1 Friendship of 1787 as well as R.I.C.O. laws and that he is actually King Abdul Mumin El of
2 Morocco. *Id.* Mr. Pigott pleads that Defendants owe him “over \$60,000,000.00 for
3 OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE...” *Id.* at 6 (emphasis in original). He goes on to allege that
4 “Attorney Barbara Linde pretended to be a Judge” and that he “demanded that the case for
5 Divorce be had in an U.S. Constitution Article III Moroccan Court, because I am a Moor/Noble
6 and there are no Official Judicial Bonds for the Judges & Oaths of Offices are void.” *Id.* He
7 goes on to challenge the procedures of the divorce proceedings, including that the judge refused
8 to recuse herself, that she “just stop listening to me and started talking to Heather Barr and was
9 asking Heather to testify against me,” and that Ms. Barr’s attorneys had a conflict of interest
10 and engaged in treason. *Id.* at 7. He alleges that Ms. Barr improperly informed the divorce
11 court of a lis pendens action against Mr. Pigott’s property, and that his property is being stolen
12 from him. Allegedly at the hearing three attorneys admitted to being at war with the Moors and
13 working for the Ku Klux Klan. *Id.* at 9. Mr. Pigott alleges that Defendants have used King
14 County Superior Court as a “war machine.” *Id.* at 11.

15
16
17
18 The Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises
19 frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from
20 such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

21 The Court does not see a basis for subject matter jurisdiction in this matter. The parties
22 all reside in the State of Washington, thus there is no jurisdiction based on diversity. The U.S.
23 Constitution and R.I.C.O. claims rest on facts that appear to be entirely frivolous. Further, any
24 claim Mr. Pigott has with the proceedings in the state court are properly addressed on appeal
25 within the state court system. Plaintiff’s Complaint appears to suffer from deficiencies that
26 require dismissal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
27
28

1 In response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a short and plain statement telling the
2 Court: (1) facts to support his R.I.C.O. claim and claim that Defendants violated a treaty as to
3 him personally in the divorce proceedings, (2) why this case is not properly brought as an
4 appeal within the state court system, and (3) why this case should not be dismissed as frivolous.
5 **This Response may not exceed six (6) pages.** Plaintiff is not to file additional pages as
6 attachments and the Court will consider no further pages. No other parties need to file a
7 response. The Court will take no further action in this case until Plaintiff has submitted this
8 Response.
9

10 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

- 11 1) Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause containing the detail
12 above **no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order.** Failure to
13 file this Response will result in dismissal of this case.
14
15 2) Mr. Pigott's prior Motions for Default, Dkts. #9, #13, #15, #17, #19, #21, #23, and
16 #25 are DENIED. Those parties cannot be in default as summonses have not been
17 issued in this case.
18
19 3) All other pending Motions are STRICKEN AS MOOT.

20
21 DATED this 28 day of October 2019.
22

23 

24 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
25 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28